REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated July 5, 2006. Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 9-14 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- rejected the title as not being descriptive;
- objected to the disclosure because of informalities; and
- rejected claims 1 - 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,578,076.

Title

The title has been amended to be more descriptive and clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Specification

The disclosure was amended to put in the patent numbers. No new matter has been added.

Overview of the Current Invention

Preferred Embodiments of the present invention provide an improved method and apparatus for configuring a local run-time environment for a user on the client workstation. Today it is common for most corporate networks to use logon scripts because they assist with centralized administration. Logon scripts are difficult to create, edit, and administer. Also logon scripts in certain run-time environments such as Windows NT/2000/2003/XP/Vista can be assigned to a single user or multiple users. Logon scripts are aptly name configuration files that run upon user logon to a workstation. The present invention allows configurations of

a local run-time environment for one or more user accounts on a workstation based on an event. Further, the present invention uses wildcards to enable easier management of groups of users on local run-time environments. A wildcard is a character in an entry that can stand for zero or more contiguous characters. The most commonly used wildcard characters are the asterisk (*), which is length invariant and represents zero or more characters in a string of characters at a given position, and the question mark (?), which is length specific and represents any one character at a given position. The use of wildcards enables easier management of a group of local run-time environments for each user of a given systems.

In order to more particularly point out this feature for configuring <u>a local run-time environment for a user on the client workstation</u>, the following language has been added to the independent claim 1 as follows:

> 1. (Currently Amended) A method in a client-server environment, to manage a configuration of resources on at least one client <u>workstation</u>, the method on a client <u>workstation</u> comprising:
>
> receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition <u>with</u> a wildcard to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings <u>for configuring a local run-time environment for at least one user</u> are applied on the client workstation, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein; and
>
> determining if the <u>at least one local run-time</u> environmental condition is met with the wildcard then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings <u>to configure the local run-time environment for the at least one user</u> on the client <u>workstation</u>.

Support for this amendment is found on page 10, paragraph [0043] and page 14, paragraph [0057].

<u>Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)</u>

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Putzolu (U.S. Patent No. 6,578,076). Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Putzolu. The Examiner at page 3 of the office action states "*Putzolu teaches a method in a client-server environment, to manage configuration of resource on at least one client system.*" Putzulo uses the term "client system" interchangeably with network resource. Specifically Putzulo states at col. 1, lines 11-15 states (emphasis added) "*A computer network, such as a corporate intranet, a local area network (LAN), or a wide area network (WAN), can be viewed as a collection of <u>network resources.</u> Network resources might include, for example, database servers, hosts, switches, routers, and firewalls. Since there are typically many different users competing for access to the same network resources, it is desirable to have some form of network management facility*" and col. 2, lines 40-52, "*One existing approach to policy-based network management applies <u>a client-server paradigm</u>, and assumes that individual network devices outsource policy decisions to management devices, called policy servers. Under this model, one or more policy servers are responsible for applying established policies to requests for use of <u>network resources.</u> <u>Network devices, such as routers and switches, act as policy clients</u>, relying on the policy server for policy-based admission control. For example, when a router receives a request to join an IP (Internet Protocol) multicast group, the router would communicate with a predetermined policy server to query whether the request can be accepted under the currently-established policies.*" In contrast the present invention is directed to "<u>configuring a local run-time environment for a user on the client workstation</u>." Putzulo is directed to managing routers and switches. A router and switch is different from a workstation such as a personal computer. To clarify that the present invention is directed to a workstation, claim 1 recites "the one or more selectable configuration settings <u>to configure the local run-time environment for the at least one user </u>on the client <u>workstation</u>." There simply is not a local run-time environment for at least one user on a router or switch. Accordingly, claim 1 of the present invention clarifies over Putzolu for at least this reason.

The Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and a proper rejection requires that a <u>single reference</u> <u>teach</u> (i.e., identically describe) each and every element of the rejected claims as being anticipated by Putzolu.[1] The elements in independent claim 1 of "<u>to configure the local run-time environment for the at least one user</u> on the client system" is <u>not</u> taught or disclosed by Putzolu. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner assertion on page 3 of the Office Action is incorrect with equating Putzolu's teach of receiving a <u>policy</u> to "<u>receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition</u>" at a workstation. The term "local client run-time environment" is clearly defined in the present invention at paragraph [0043] reproduced here for convenience as "*one or more operating environment variables which are determined at client run-time, including but not limited to an operating system which is running, a MAC address, user name, workstation name, TCIP/IP address, host address, site, domain, connection method, whether the client system is a portable device or desktop device and any other setting not typically determined until the client system has started.*" Stated differently, Putzolo's definition of a <u>policy</u> is <u>not</u> a workstation condition that is typically determined after the workstation has started. In contrast Putzolu's use of the term policy is for managing network resources such as switches and routers. See Putzolu at col. 1, lines 29-43. Putzolu is completely silent applying configuration settings to a workstation based upon a workstation condition that are typically not determined until the workstation has started i.e. "determining if the environmental condition is met with the wildcard then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings <u>to configure the local run-time environment for the at</u> <u>least one user</u> on the client <u>workstation.</u>" Accordingly, the present invention distinguishes over Putzolu for at least this reason. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

---

[1] See MPEP §2131 (Emphasis Added) "A claim is anticipated only if <u>each and every element</u> as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a <u>single</u> prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Putzolu. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 2-8 distinguish over Putzolu, as well.

Regarding claims 5-8, these have been amended to distinguish groupings of <u>if the at least one local run-time conditions</u> are met to emphasize in claim 5 different types of memberships for the client workstation; for claim 6, client workstation names; for claim 7 different network addresses; and for claim 8 portable, desktop, and connection method i.e. LAN or dialup. Putzolu is simply silent on applying configuration settings based on these groupings of local run-time conditions on a client workstation. Accordingly, claims 5 – 8 distinguish over Putzolu for this reason as well.

Claims 9-14 have been added to clarify various patentable features of managing workstations based upon selectable configuration settings and applying some of these configurations settings <u>to configure the local run-time environment for the at least one user</u> on the client <u>workstation</u>.

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon was reviewed and Applicants believe that such prior art is not pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR

§1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and their attorneys.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to change any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1556. In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and re-examination is requested.

PLEASE CALL the undersigned if the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way it would help expedite the prosecution of the patent application.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: December 5, 2006

By: /Jon Gibbons/
Jon A. Gibbons(Reg. No.37,333)
Attorney for Applicant

FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS,
GUTMAN, BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
One Boca Commerce Center
551 N.W. 77th Street
Suite 111, Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812
www.FocusOnIP.com